

BEST AVAILABLE COPY**REMARKS**

Applicants request the Examiner to consider the following comments:

The instant Application is the subject of an Office Action dated March 23, 2005 with a 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection. The Examiner stated that the term MFR was indefinite because it was defined as melt flow ratio, a unitless value, while some of the MFR values do have units inadvertently associated with them in the specification. Additionally, the Examiner indicated that the MFR identified as being measured by ASTM 1238-D, Condition L rendered the claims reciting MFR indefinite because ASTM 1238-D, Condition L refers to a temperature of 230°C while the melt index (MI) values and high load melt index (HLMI) values are indicated as being measured at 190°C. Applicants traverse this rejection for the reasons detailed below.

The inclusion of the term "Condition L" in reference to the ASTM D-1238 method of measuring melt flow ratio (MRF) is an error that is obvious to one of skill in the art, as is the correction. One of skill in the art understands that the MFR in the Application refers to the polyethylene polymers for which melt index and high load melt index are measured at 190°C. Since the MFR is simply the ratio of HLMI divided by MI, both measured at 190°C as indicated by Conditions E and F of ASTM D-1238, respectively, it is clear to one of skill in the art that the reference to ASTM D-1238 for MFR also necessarily refers 190°C, not the Condition L temperature of 230°C. Additional evidence and support for Applicant's amendments is that the Abstract correctly shows the MFR values as being unitless.

Applicant respectfully submits that the errors with respect to the parent application are obvious to one of skill in the art and that the corrections are obvious to one of skill in the art and that the corrections are obvious to one of skill in the art. Applicant respectfully submits that entry of the amendments to the specification and claims is proper. Applicant submits that the claims are not indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for the reasons given above. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection.

USSN: 10/715,065

7

E:\P\OLA\W\Prosecution\IMCC Prosecution\2003\2003B122\US\2003B122-US-20051205-Response.doc

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Attorney Docket No.: 2003B122 (U.S.)

Applicants invite the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney, if there are any issues outstanding which have not been presented to the Examiner's satisfaction.

Respectfully submitted,

July 5, 2005

Date

Louis N. Moreno

Louis N. Moreno

Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 44,953

ExxonMobil Chemical Co.
Law Technology
P.O. Box 2149
Baytown, Texas 77522-2149
Phone: 281-834-5675
Fax: 281-834-2495

USSN: 10/715,065

8

E:\SPC\LA\Prosecution\EMCC Prosecution\2003\2003B122\US2003B122-US-2005Jul03-Response.doc